

Toward an invariant matrix model for the Anderson Transition

Fabio Franchini*

*INFN, Sezione di Firenze, Via G. Sansone 1,
50019 Sesto Fiorentino (FI), Italy*

*SISSA and I.N.F.N, Sezione di Trieste,
Via Bonomea 265, 34136, Trieste (TS), Italy and
Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute
of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

(Dated: March 12, 2015)

Abstract

We consider invariant matrix models with log-normal (asymptotic) weight. It is known that their eigenvalue distribution is intermediate between Wigner-Dyson and Poissonian, which candidates these models for describing a system intermediate between the extended and localized phase. We show that they have a much richer energy landscape than expected, with their partition functions decomposable in a large number of equilibrium configurations, growing exponentially with the matrix rank. Within each of these saddle points, eigenvalues are uncorrelated and confined by a different potential felt by each eigenvalue. The equilibrium positions induced by the potentials differ in different saddles. Instantons connecting the different equilibrium configurations are responsible for the correlations between the eigenvalues. We argue that these instantons can be linked to the $SU(2)$ components in which the rotational symmetry can be decomposed, paving the way to understand the conjectured critical breaking of $U(N)$ symmetry in these invariant models.

*Electronic address: ffranchi@sissa.it

I. INTRODUCTION

Random matrices were introduced to describe the spectrum of heavy nuclei [1], but over the years it has been realized that they have the power to describe a large universality class of many-body strongly interacting systems, with applications ranging from nuclear physics to string theory, from 2-D quantum gravity to condensed matter physics, from statistical physics to econo-physics, from neuroscience to chaos theory, from number theory to integrable systems, and so [2–4]. Although in different applications the matrices can have different interpretations, we can use the partition function and the free energy as unifying concepts

$$\mathcal{Z} \equiv C_N \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{M} e^{-\frac{1}{g}W(\mathbf{M})}, \quad \mathcal{F} \equiv \ln \mathcal{Z}, \quad (1)$$

since, as usual, they can be used as generators for all physical observables (C_N is an normalization constant introduced for later convenience). Here g is a coupling constant, $\mathbf{M}$ is an $N \times N$ Hermitian matrix and $W(\mathbf{M})$ is the (matrix-valued) action. One can also consider different symmetry classes for the matrices, for instance orthogonal or symplectic, but we will concentrate just on the Hermitian case.

Typically, matrix models are considered in a basis invariant way, that is, the action in (1) is assumed invariant under a $U(N)$ rotation of the matrix: $W(\mathbf{M}) = \text{tr} V(\mathbf{M})$. This choice is often motivated by physical reasons, but in any case invariant matrix models enjoy several powerful techniques for their study, which provides even non-perturbative results: from the use of orthogonal polynomials to the Riemann-Hilbert formulation, from the Coulomb gas approach to the mapping into Toda lattices, and so forth [2–4].

The versatility of random matrices is a consequence of a large universality, captured by a quadratic potential and valid for any polynomial $V(x)$. This universality is signaled by the correlated eigenvalue statistics known as Wigner-Dyson (WD) statistics. Its main feature is *level repulsion*: a characteristic suppression of the probability of finding two eigenvalues arbitrarily close. To capture this effect, one considers the level spacing distribution, that is, the distribution of the distance between eigenvalues. All standard, invariant matrix models present the same curve, hallmark of the universal WD level spacing, which is shared by a variety of strongly interacting systems.

The WD statistics for the eigenvalues has emerged as a defining signature of extended states for the eigenfunctions. Physically, one understands this connection because the eigenvalues interact only through their eigenvectors and thus, to repel one-another, their eigenstates need to have a finite overlap. Mathematically, this connection is well captured by the invariant matrix models, since the eigenstate and eigenvalue contributions decouple in the partition function:

$$\mathcal{Z} = C_N \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{M} e^{-\frac{1}{g} \text{tr } V(\mathbf{M})} = C_N \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{U} \int d\Lambda \Delta^2(\Lambda) e^{-\frac{1}{g} \sum_j^N V(\lambda_j)} , \quad (2)$$

where the Hermitian matrix has been decomposed in its eigenvalues and eigenvectors as $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{U}^\dagger \Lambda \mathbf{U}$, with Λ a diagonal matrix of entries λ_j and where $\Delta(\Lambda) \equiv \prod_{j>l}^N (\lambda_j - \lambda_l)$ is the Van der Monde determinant which emerges as the Jacobian in changing integration variables from the matrix elements to the eigenvalue/eigenvector representation. We remark that this Jacobian introduces an effective interaction between the eigenvalues, which leads to a Coulomb Gas picture:

$$\mathcal{Z} = C_N \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{U} \int d\Lambda e^{-\frac{1}{g} \sum_j^N V(\lambda_j) + 2 \sum_{j>l}^N \ln |\lambda_j - \lambda_l|} , \quad (3)$$

in which the eigenvalues are interpreted as one-dimensional particles, confined by the potential $V(x)$ and interacting through a logarithmic repulsion. The balance of these two contrasting forces results in an equilibrium configuration for which the eigenvalues spread around the minima of $V(x)$.

The factorization in (2) has lead to the conclusion that the eigenvector distribution is independent from $V(\mathbf{M})$ and thus uniform over the N -dimensional sphere spanned by the Hilbert space. This behavior characterizes invariant matrix models as describing extended systems, i.e. systems where in any energy window at least one of the eigenvectors has all finite entries. This means that, when the matrix model is applied to mesoscopic systems, it only describes conducting states, i.e. situations where the disorder is not strong enough to localize the wavefunctions.

Recently, it was realized and shown that this expectation is violated when the eigenvalue distribution deviates from the WD [5]. In particular, if two eigenvalues are separated by a gap, their eigenvectors cannot mix. Without reference to a preferred basis, localization means that an eigenvector can move only within a portion of the whole Hilbert space and that an arbitrary, not-too-strong, perturbation cannot change this. If the eigenvalues of an invariant matrix model distribute over n disconnected intervals, each of which containing m_j ($j = 1 \dots n$) eigenvalues, each eigenvector is localized over the m_j -dimensional portion of the Hilbert space spanned

by the eigenvectors of the other eigenvalues in that interval. This phenomenon corresponds to a spontaneous breaking of $U(N)$ rotational symmetry into $\prod_{j=1}^n U(m_j)$. As in any spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB), the directions of these patches of Hilbert space are random and uniform (they can be induced by an external small symmetry breaking term), but once the system has chosen them, it is hard to change them and impossible in the thermodynamic limit.

In [5] the SSB of rotational symmetry was proven for matrix model with potentials able to separate the eigenvalues in disconnected patches, the so-called *multi-cut solutions*. We are going to show that there exists another class of invariant matrix models, where the external potential is so weak that it combines with the interparticle interaction to generate an effective potential induced self-consistently by the eigenvalue distribution. The net effect of this process is that the partition function can be decomposed in the contributions of several saddle points, corresponding to different equilibrium configurations and thus of different effective potentials felt by the eigenvalues.

II. THE WEAKLY CONFINED MATRIX MODEL

We will consider a $U(N)$ invariant ensemble of random matrix characterized by a non-polynomial confining potential [6, 11], that is, with a potential of the form

$$V(x) \simeq \frac{1}{2\kappa} \ln^2 |x|, \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4)$$

where κ controls the strength of the interaction. This soft confinement justifies the name Weakly Confined Matrix Models (WCMM) for these systems.

The logarithmic behavior sets these potentials apart from the usual matrix models, where the potentials are polynomial in the matrix eigenvalues. Most importantly, this difference implies that the WCMM do not belong to the WD universality class. In fact, the level spacing is intermediate between the WD (approached for $\kappa \rightarrow 0$) and the Poissonian distribution (corresponding at the $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ limit), typical of a completely localized system [6]. Moreover, the density-density correlation function of the WCMM (in the unfolded coordinates) matches the expectations for the Anderson model at the metal/insulator transition [7], at least in the perturbative regimes.

These observations have lead over the years to the conjecture that the WCMM can spontaneously break rotational invariance. In [8] it was shown that in the $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ limit the eigenvalues crystallize on a regular lattice, so that they do not interact

anymore. This observation was used in [9] to argue that this eigenvalue behavior reflects the complete localization of eigenvectors, corresponding to a breaking of $U(N)$ symmetry into a $U(1)^N$, consistently with what expected from the level spacing behavior. Starting from these results, we will show what happens to the eigenvalue distribution at finite κ and argue how this behavior reflects a critical breaking of $U(N)$, consistent with the conjectured relation between WCMM and the Anderson Metal/Insulator Transition (MIT).

The Riemann-Hilbert problem associated to potentials of the type (4) cannot be solved. Moreover, these potentials have an indeterminate moment problem, that is, the same set of orthogonal polynomials have the same set of moments with respect to several different measures. Nonetheless, the WCMM can be exactly solved using the technique of orthogonal polynomials and in this way all the spectral characteristics have been calculated. The WCMM were actually introduced as the first example of a matrix model solvable using q -deformed (Hermite or Laguerre) polynomials, where the deformation parameter is determined by κ [6]. We stress once more that, because of the indetermination of the moment problem, different potentials sharing the same asymptotic behavior (4) are solved by the same set of polynomials.

For the moment, let us assume that the potential is *exactly* log-square and that the eigenvalues are confined to the positive semi-axis. We perform the change of variables

$$\lambda_j = e^{\kappa x_j} , \quad (5)$$

in the partition function, getting

$$\mathcal{Z} = C_N \text{Vol}[U(N)] \kappa^N \int \prod_{j=1}^N dx_j \prod_{n < m} (e^{\kappa x_n} - e^{\kappa x_m})^2 e^{-\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{l=1}^N [x_l^2 - 2x_l]} , \quad (6)$$

where $\text{Vol}[U(N)] = \prod_{n=1}^N \frac{(2\pi)^n}{n!}$ is the volume of the unitary group.

Working in a simplex where the eigenvalues are sorted in increasing order ($x_j > x_l$ for $j > l$), we can write

$$\mathcal{Z} = C_N \text{Vol}[U(N)] \kappa^N N! \int \prod_{j=1}^N dx_j \prod_{n < m} [1 - e^{\kappa(x_n - x_m)}]^2 e^{-\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{l=1}^N [x_l^2 - 2(2l-1)x_l]} . \quad (7)$$

In [8] it was noted that in the $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ limit, all the exponentials in the Van der Monde determinant can be neglected and the eigenvalues crystallize:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Z} &= C_N \text{Vol}[U(N)] \kappa^N N! \exp \left[\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N (2n-1)^2 \right] \int \prod_{j=1}^N dx_j e^{-\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{l=1}^N (x_l + 1 - 2l)^2} \\ &= C_N \text{Vol}[U(N)] N! e^{\frac{\kappa}{6} N(4N^2 - 1)} (2\pi\beta)^{N/2} . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In the large κ limit, the eigenvalue distribution factorizes and the interaction between the eigenvalues can be exactly accounted by an new effective potential, which has the net effect of localizing each eigenvalue on a perfect lattice with a quadratic potential of width $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}$. In [8] this phenomenology was discussed in details and it was shown that the eigenvalues become effectively uncorrelated in the $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ limit. In [9] it was further shown that this crystallization of the eigenvalues tends to localize the eigenvectors as well. In fact the largest eigenvalue becomes exponentially larger than its closest neighbor and this means that rotating the diagonal matrix with a generic, uniformly distributed, unitary matrix produces a matrix with negligible off-diagonal elements. One can thus trace out the row and column corresponding to this eigenvalue and the same procedure can be applied again to the new highest eigenvalue. This structure was further confirmed by a numerical analysis in which a set of random matrices was generated with the crystallized eigenvalue distribution. These matrices were perturbed by multiplying the off-diagonal elements by a factor slightly less than unity. The resulting eigenvector distribution showed a significant deviation from the Porter-Thomas, indicating a localization of the eigenvectors. These arguments were the first direct proof that the crystallization of the eigenvalues affects the distribution of eigenvectors and tends to localize them. We can characterize this phenomenon as a breaking of the original $U(N)$ symmetry into a $U^N(1)$.

III. FINITE κ ANALYSIS

We saw that in the $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the particles realize a sort of Mott-insulator that pins them to a lattice. In (7) let us set

$$C_N \equiv \frac{e^{-\frac{\kappa}{6}N(4N^2-1)}}{(2\pi\beta)^{N/2} \text{Vol}[U(N)]} \quad (9)$$

and define $x_n = 2n - 1 + t_n$:

$$\mathcal{Z} = \left(\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}\right)^{N/2} \int \prod_{j=1}^N dt_j \prod_{n < m} [1 - e^{-2\kappa(m-n)} e^{\kappa(t_n - t_m)}]^2 e^{-\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{l=1}^N t_l^2}. \quad (10)$$

If the eigenvalues are ordered, for $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$, the term $e^{-\kappa(m-n)}$ vanishes. It can be checked (and it will become more apparent as we proceed) that by removing the square from the Van der Monde determinant, we also remove the terms responsible

for the other ordering of particles. Thus, in this way can work within one simplex without worrying about particle ordering anymore:

$$\mathcal{Z} = \left(\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}\right)^{N/2} N! \int \prod_{j=1}^N dt_j \prod_{m=2}^N \prod_{n=1}^{m-1} [1 - e^{-2\kappa n} e^{-\kappa(t_m - t_{m-n})}] e^{-\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{l=1}^N t_l^2}. \quad (11)$$

For large κ we can now use $e^{-2\kappa n}$ as an expansion parameter. In fact, we see that the effect of each term in the Van der Monde is to add a linear displacement to the quadratic potential, and thus it changes the equilibrium position of the particles. For $n = 1$, a pair of nearest neighboring eigenvalues move from $2n - 1$ and $2n + 1$ to $2n$. For $n = 2$ next-to-nearest neighbors move from $2n - 1$ and $2n + 3$ respectively to $2n$ and $2n + 2$, and so on. After integration, each Gaussian integral contributes with a factor $e^{-\kappa n}$. Thus, we introduce the expansion parameter $q \equiv e^{-\kappa}$.

At zeroth order, from (8), of course we have

$$\mathcal{Z}_0 = \left(\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}\right)^{N/2} \int \prod_{j=1}^N dt_j e^{-\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{l=1}^N t_l^2} = 1. \quad (12)$$

At first order in q we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_1 &= \mathcal{Z}_0 - q^2 \left(\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}\right)^{N/2} \sum_{m=2}^N \int \prod_{j=1}^N dt_j e^{-\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{l=1}^N t_l^2 + \kappa(t_{m-1} - t_m)} \\ &= \mathcal{Z}_0 - (N-1)q. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

At the next order things start to complicate a bit, because we have three types of contributions: from two pairs of distinct nearest neighbors, from triplets of nearest neighbors and from pairs of next-to-nearest:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_2 &= \mathcal{Z}_1 + q^4 \left(\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}\right)^{N/2} \int \prod_{j=1}^N dt_j e^{-\frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{l=1}^N t_l^2} \times \\ &\quad \times \left[\sum_{m_1=4}^N e^{\kappa(t_{m_1-1} - t_{m_1})} \sum_{m_2=2}^{m_1-2} e^{\kappa(t_{m_2-1} - t_{m_2})} - (1-1) \sum_{m=3}^N e^{\kappa(t_{m-2} - t_m)} \right] \\ &= \mathcal{Z}_0 + \frac{(N-2)(N-3)}{2} q^2. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We see that the last two contributions amount to the same process, but with equal and opposite weight.

Additional terms can be worked out similarly, but it is easy to see that the final result is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z} &= \prod_{n=1}^{N-1} (1 - q^n)^{N-n} \\ &= 1 - (N-1)q + \frac{(N-2)(N-3)}{2}q^2 + \mathcal{O}(q^2),\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

which coincides with the exact result obtained in [10], using the technique of orthogonal polynomials (in this case, the Stieltjes-Wigert polynomials), once the overall normalization C_N is taken into account. We see that the first line of (15) derives directly from the Van der Monde in (11) and allows for a straightforward interpretation of the partition function.

IV. THE ENERGY LANDSCAPE

Starting from the $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ configuration, in which each eigenvalue x_j has equilibrium position at $2j-1$ ($j = 1 \dots N$), each term in the Van der Monde adds a linear contribution to the quadratic potential and thus shifts the positions pairwise closer by one unity. All the configurations reached this way are stable by construction (small fluctuations are confined by the potential) and thus constitutes saddle points of the partition function. The terms of the Van der Monde connecting the different configurations have a natural interpretation as an instanton.

Every equilibrium configuration with center of mass at m is realized by the action of the instantons: all these configurations have the same leading weight (given by C_N and growing like $e^{\frac{2}{3}\kappa N^3}$) and differ only by subleading contributions, with a power of q equal to the number of steps each eigenvalue traveled to reach this configuration, starting from the $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ one. In some of these configurations, the equilibrium point for more than one eigenvalue can coincide (in fact, the action of every allowed instanton brings all eigenvalues to oscillate around the same point m). Thus, there is an exponential number (in N) of possible equilibrium configurations. In each of them, eigenvalues are only subjected to the effective potential and do not interact. Hence, the eigenvalue correlation is a purely instantonic effect. In fact, these instantons have a fermionic nature, in that each of them contributes with a minus sign and only one instanton connecting two given eigenvalues is allowed.

The partition function (15) has a natural interpretation in terms of the instantons, since only the largest eigenvalue can be connected to the smallest by a instanton with

weight $-q^{N-1}$, while there are two ways to connect a pair of eigenvalues $N-2$ apart and so on, concluding with the $N-1$ instantons connecting nearest neighboring eigenvalues.

This newly discovered energy landscape is characteristic of a complex system and calls for the usual tools employed in the analysis of these systems. Intriguingly, the mathematical framework we just outlined shares many similarities with a recently discussed glassy system, of hard spheres in infinite dimensionality [12].

In [5], it was argued that instantons like the ones we discussed are responsible for restoring the broken symmetries. Since the $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ configurations correspond to a breaking of $U(N)$ symmetry into $U(1)^N$, each instanton can be interpreted as restoring the $SU(2)$ component connecting the two eigenvalues.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We showed that the partition function of the weakly confined matrix models can be decomposed into a exponential number of independent equilibrium configurations, corresponding to different equilibrium points for each eigenvalue of the matrix. The different configurations are connected by instantons, which can be interpreted as generators of the the symmetries in which the $U(N)$ invariance is broken, according to [5].

The WCMM is conjecture to represent a toy model for the Anderson Metal Insulator Transition. The structure unveiled supports this conjecture and draws a novel connection between localization problems and systems with complex energy landscapes, such as the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model [13].

Moreover, the analytically continued WCMM is connected to Chern-Simons theories [10] and SUSY string theories, such as ABJM [15]. In particular, the ABJM partition function in the localization limit corresponding to the matrix models can be interpreted in terms of a free Fermi gas at finite temperatures [16]: it seems that this is a gas of instantons and thus the rich energy landscape should be analysed in this field theory formulation as well.

We considered models with an exact log-normal potentials: more general potentials can be considered, but we believe that the qualitative structure of the energy landscape will not change. Such generalizations include potentials which can be written as polynomials in logarithm of the matrix. A more interesting extension will be the treatment to the case of eigenvalues over the whole real axis, where non-local correlations between eigenvalues at opposite sides of the origin have been

observed [11], and interpreted in terms of a Luttinger liquid in a Hawking-Hartle bath [14].

-
- [1] E. P. Wigner, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **47**, 790 (1951).
On the statistical distribution of the widths and spacings of nuclear resonance levels
 E. P. Wigner, Annals of Math. **62**, 548 (1955).
Characteristic vectors of bordered matrices with infinite dimensions
 - [2] M. L. Mehta; *Random Matrices*, Elsevier Academic Press (2004).
 - [3] E. Brezin, V. Kazakov, D. Serban, P. Wiegmann, & A. Zabrodin (Editors); *Applications of Random Matrices in Physics*, Springer (2006).
 - [4] G. Akemann, J. Baik, & P. Di Francesco (Editors); *The Oxford Handbook of Random Matrix Theory*, Oxford University Press (2011).
 - [5] F. Franchini; arXiv:1412.6523.
"On the Spontaneous Breaking of $U(N)$ symmetry in invariant Matrix Models".
 - [6] K.A. Muttalib, Y. Chen, M.E.H. Ismail, and V.N. Nicopoulos; Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 471 (1993);
"New Family of Unitary Random Matrices".
 - [7] V.E. Kravtsov, and A.M. Tsvelik; Phys. Rev. **B 62**, 9888 (2000);
"Energy level dynamics in systems with weakly multifractal eigenstates: Equivalence to one-dimensional correlated fermions at low temperatures".
 - [8] E. Bogomolny, O. Bohigas, and M. P. Pato, Phys. Rev. **E 55**, 6707 (1997)
 - [9] M.P. Pato, Phys. Rev. **E 61**, R3291 (2000)
 - [10] M. Tierz, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 19**, 1365-1378 (2004);
"Soft matrix models and Chern-Simons partition functions".
 - [11] C.M. Canali, and V.E. Kravtsov; Phys. Rev. **E 51**, R5185 (1995);
"Normalization sum rule and spontaneous breaking of $U(N)$ invariance in random matrix ensembles".
 - [12] P. Charbonneau, J. Kurchan, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, & F. Zamponi; Nat. Comm **5**, 3725 (2014).
 - [13] M. Mezard, G. Parisi, & M. Virasoro; *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond*, World Scientific (1987).
 - [14] F. Franchini & V. E. Kravtsov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 166401 (2009)

- “Horizon in Random Matrix Theory, Hawking Radiation and Flow of Cold Atoms”.*
- [15] M. Mariño; *Chern-Simons Theory, Matrix Models, and Topological Strings*, Oxford University Press (2005).
- [16] M. Mariño & P. Putrov; J. Stat. Mech. **03**, P03001 (2012).
“ABJM theory as a Fermi gas”.

